

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 7-11, 13 and 14 are presently active in this application, Claims 1, 10 and 11 having been amended by the present Amendment, and Claims 6 and 12 having previously been canceled in the Amendment filed April 15, 2003.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 1-13 [sic: 1-14] were finally rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Okimoto et al (U.S. Patent 6,310,694)

In light of the outstanding rejection, Claim 1 has been amended to clarify a distinction between the claimed invention and the cited art. To that end, consistent with the disclosure at page 12, lines 16-21 of the specification, Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the printer driver has --a function to convert the document data provided by said application program into a data format processable by an application program of an electronic mail receiver and a function to transmit the converted document data via electronic mail.-- Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

The significance of the amendment to Claim 1 lies in that according to Applicants' invention, the printer driver has a function to convert document data into a data format processable by an application program of an electronic mail receiver, other than PDL, so as to send the converted document data via email. Thus, an application, receives the converted document data via email, and can apply a process other than a printing process to the document data without changing the format. For example, the document data can be displayed on a display unit without changing the format of the document data received via email.

The outstanding Official Action relies on column 25, lines 28-34 of the Okimoto et al reference as teaching that “the printer driver process of FIG. 4 creates print data in the same format as required to print on the transmitter’s side.” Thus, the format of the print data in the above description must be the Print Description Language (PDL) since it is clearly recited that the format is for requesting printing.

Additionally, since the object of the invention of the Okimoto et al reference is that “the computer on receiving end can directly extract the print data from the mail and then outputs that data directly to the printer,” it is apparent that the Okimoto et al reference teaches only the Page Description Language (PDL) as the output format for the receiving end and no formats other than PDL are taken into consideration or suggested.

Further, the Okimoto et al reference at column 25, lines 37-40 merely discloses a PDL type printer of a remote user. Additionally, if any type is not registered for the remote user, the predetermined Page Description Language (PCL in this example), or character data in the original data is converted into print data, as evident from the discussion at column 26, lines 4-7. The Okimoto et al reference provides no disclosure of any formats other than PDL and does not suggest that other formats can be practiced..

In light of the above discussion, it is respectfully submitted that the Okimoto et al reference discloses nothing about formats other than the Page Description Language (PDL). And in no way anticipates the presently claimed invention which explicitly is limited to a data format processible by an application program of an electronic mail receiver. In view of this distinction, it is respectfully submitted that amended Claim 1 patentably defines over the Okimoto et al reference, as do Claims 2-5, 7-9 and 14 dependent on Claim 1.

Claims 10 and 11 have also been amended to refer to a data format processible by an application program of an electronic mail receiver, and for the same reasons as above noted

Application No. 09/398,038

Reply to Office Action of September 12, 2003

with respect to Claim 1, Claims 10, 11 and dependent Claim 13 are also believed to be allowable.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussion, the amended claims are believed to be in condition for formal allowance, and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 08/03)

I:\ATTY\EHK\AMEND-RESPONSES\05574774-RCE-AMT.DOC